The copyright © of this thesis belongs to its rightful author and/or other copyright owner. Copies can be accessed and downloaded for non-commercial or learning purposes without any charge and permission. The thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted as a whole without the permission from its rightful owner. No alteration or changes in format is allowed without permission from its rightful owner.

TRANING EFFECTIVENESS OF BASIC TECHNICAL PROGRAMME AT INSTITUTE TECHNOLOGY AEROSPACE , KOLEJ TENTERA UDARA

By

CHE ZUNIDA BT CHE AZMI

Universiti Utara Malaysia

Thesis Submitted to
Othman Yeop Abdullah Graduate School of Business
Universiti Utara Malaysia,
in Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Master of Human Resource Management

Pusat Pengajian Pengurusan Perniagaan
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS MANAGEMENT
Universiti Utara Malaysia

PERAKUAN KERJA KERTAS PENYELIDIKAN
(Certification of Research Paper)

Saya, mengaku bertandatangan, memperakukan bahawa
(I, the undersigned, certified that)
CHE ZUNIDA BTE CHE AZMI (823418)

Calon untuk Ijazah Sarjana
(Candidate for the degree of)
MASTER OF HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

telah mengemukakan kertas penyelidikan yang bertajuk
(has presented his/her research paper of the following title)

TRAINING EFFECTIVENESS OF BASIC TECHNICAL PROGRAMME AT INSTITUTE TECHNOLOGY AEROSPACE, KOLEJ TENTERA UDARA

Seperti yang tercatat di muka surat tajuk dan kulit kertas penyelidikan
(as it appears on the title page and front cover of the research paper)

Universiti Utara Malaysia

Bahawa kertas penyelidikan tersebut boleh diterima dari segi bentuk serta kandungan dan meliputi bidang ilmu dengan memuaskan.
(that the research paper acceptable in the form and content and that a satisfactory knowledge of the field is covered by the research paper).

Nama Penyelia Pertama : **DR. SHAHRIZAL BIN BADLISHAH**
(Name of 1st Supervisor)

Tandatangan :
(Signature)

Nama Penyelia Kedua : **PROF. MADYA DR. KAMAL BIN AB HAMID**
(Name of 2nd Supervisor)

Tandatangan :
(Signature)

Tarikh : **12 DISEMBER 2019**
(Date)

PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this dissertation/project paper in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Post Graduate degree from the Universiti Utara Malaysia (UUM), I agree that the Library of this university may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying this dissertation/project paper in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by my supervisor(s) or in their absence, by the Dean of Othman Yeop Abdullah Graduate School of Business where I did my dissertation/project paper. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this dissertation/project paper parts of it for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the UUM in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my dissertation/project paper.

Request for permission to copy or make other use of materials in this dissertation, in whole or in part should be addressed to:

Dean of Othman Yeop Abdullah Graduate School of Business
Universiti Utara Malaysia
06010 UUM Sintok
Kedah Darul Aman

Universiti Utara Malaysia

ABSTRACT

The role of training for improvement of skills and knowledge has long been acknowledged. Institute Technology Aerospace (ITAS), Kolej Tentera Udara (KTU) is a training centre where Royal Malaysia Airforce (RMAF) trains technicians for maintaining the aircrafts. Trainees who are exposed to effective training generally possess technical knowledge, skills and attitudes to carry out their tasks. ITAS is committed to produce trained RMAF technical personnel and continuously improve the training processes. The purpose of this study was to identify the relationship between individual factors, environment factor and employee learning factor on the training effectiveness. A total of 102 trainees of ITAS, KTU participated in the survey by filling out the study questionnaires. From 102 questionnaires that have been distributed, there are only 100 answered questionnaires were usable for data analysis, while 2 questionnaires were unusable. The Statistical Package for the Social Science version 25.0 (SPSS) approach was utilized to test the hypotheses. Regression Analysis was used to determine the strength of the relationship between dependent variable and independent variable. The result of the direct relationship between the independent variables (individual factors, environment factor and employee learning factor) and the dependent variable (training effectiveness) show that they influence training effectiveness. This research provides better understanding on training effectiveness in ITAS, KTU and potential use of findings can be used by the organization as a reference for future research.

Keyword: trainee, self-efficacy, motivation, training effectiveness.

ABSTRAK

Peranan latihan untuk meningkatkan kemahiran dan pengetahuan telah lama diakui. Institut Teknologi Aeroangkasa (ITAS), Kolej Tentera Udara (KTU) adalah pusat latihan di mana Tentera Udara Malaysia (TUDM) melatih juruteknik untuk kerja penyelenggaraan pesawat. Pelatih yang terdedah kepada latihan yang berkesan umumnya memiliki pengetahuan teknikal, kemahiran dan sikap untuk menjalankan tugas mereka. ITAS komited untuk menghasilkan kakitangan teknikal TUDM terlatih dan terus memperbaiki proses latihan. Tujuan kajian ini adalah untuk mengenal pasti hubungan antara faktor individu, faktor persekitaran dan faktor pembelajaran pekerja terhadap keberkesanan latihan. Seramai 102 pelatih ITAS, KTU mengambil bahagian dalam tinjauan dengan mengisi borang soal selidik kajian. Daripada 102 borang soal selidik yang telah diedarkan, hanya 100 borang yang dijawab untuk analisis data, manakala 2 borang tidak dapat digunakan. Pendekatan Statistik untuk Sains Sosial versi 25.0 (SPSS) telah digunakan untuk menguji hipotesis kajian. Analisis regresi digunakan untuk menentukan kekuatan hubungan antara pemboleh ubah bergantung dan pemboleh ubah bebas. Hasil hubungan langsung antara pembolehubah bebas (faktor individu, faktor persekitaran dan faktor pembelajaran pekerja) dan pemboleh ubah bergantung (keberkesanan latihan) menunjukkan bahawa mereka mempengaruhi keberkesanan latihan. Penyelidikan ini memberikan pemahaman yang lebih baik tentang keberkesanan latihan dalam ITAS, KTU dan penggunaan potensi penemuan boleh digunakan oleh organisasi sebagai rujukan untuk penyelidikan masa depan.

Kata kunci: pelatih, keberkesanan diri, motivasi pekerja, keberkesanan latihan.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the name of ALLAH, the most gracious, the most merciful. This research could not have been possible without the God's grace, guidance and strength. I would like to express my deepest appreciation to all those who provided me the possibility to carry out this research. A special gratitude to my supervisors, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Kamal bin Ab Hamid and Dr. Shahrizal bin Badlishah, who kindly accepted to be my supervisors and providing their professional expertise, guidance and suggestions.

My deepest and utmost appreciation goes to Brig Gen Dato' Dr. Ismail bin Manuri (R) who has gave encouragement, insight, professional guidance and constructive feedbacks that put me on the right track. I also want to express my appreciation to those who participated in the survey to make this research possible and meaningful. To my late father, Che Azmi Rejab, to my mother, Halijah Edar, brothers, sisters and all my friend, thank you so much for your support and prayers. Finally yet importantly, my deepest appreciation goes to my husband Mohd Nazir, my children (Harith, Nur Qistina and Zharfan) for their patience, understanding, encouragement and support throughout the process of completing this research. This research will not be completed without the cooperation and support from the management of Universiti Utara Malaysia.

May Allah bless all of you for your kindness. Ameen.

Universiti Utara Malaysia

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Universiti Utara Malaysia

Universiti Utara Malaysia

Universiti Utara Malaysia

Universiti Utara Malaysia

Universiti Utara Malaysia

LIST OF TABLES

Universiti Utara Malaysia

LIST OF FIGURE

Universiti Utara Malaysia

LIST OF ABBREVATIONS

EF	Environment Factor
ELF	Employee Learning Factor
DGTA	Directorate General Technical Airworthiness
HRD	Human Resource Development
IF	Individual Factor
ITAS	Institute Technology of Aerospace
KTU	Kolej Tentera Udara
RMAF	Royal Malaysia Airforce
RQ	Research Question
SE	Self-efficacy
SPSS	Statistical Package for the Social Science
TE	Training Effectiveness

Universiti Utara Malaysia

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction

This study seek to analyze the relationship created between the factors of; individuals, environment and employee learning towards training effectiveness among the trainees of Institute Technology Aerospace (ITAS), Kolej Tentera Udara (KTU). This chapter outlines the background of the study and details on how the research will be carried out. It also explore on the problem statement, research questions, objectives of the study, significance of the study, scope of study, definition of key terms and also on the organization of the thesis.

1.2 Background of study

Many researchers have argued that training is one of the most frequently used interventions in Human Resource Development (HRD) (Scaduto, Lindsay & Chiaburu, 2008; Cacciattolo, 2015; Sugrue, O'Driscoll, & Blair, 2005). Training is also an important and essential factor that contributes to the service quality (Zumrah, 2014). Training effectiveness is defined as the degree to which individuals effectively apply the knowledge, skills, and attitudes gained in training context to the job (Baldwin & Ford, 1988; Wexley & Latham, 2002; Honey & Mumford, 1986; Sian, Ahmad, Ismail, &Ismail, 2011).

Training becomes so important when human capital, knowledge and skills become one tool for us to compete in the world that is heading towards globalization. Training to be said effective if the skills and behaviors learned and practiced during training can be transferred to the workplace and can be applied in the context of the job. It should also be maintained over time and can be generalized across contexts (Baldwin & Ford, 1988; Holton, 2005). Effective training is training that improves performance, and improved performance help to

REFERENCES

Adiwayu Ansar, Z. (2012). *The relationship Between Workload, Job Satisfaction and Absenteeism Among Staff Nurses at Institut Jantung Negara (IJN) (Doctoral dissertation,*Universiti Utara Malaysia.

Alliger, G. M. & Janak, R. A. (1989) Kirkpatrick's levels of training criteria: Thirty years later. Personnel Psychology, 42(2), 331-342.

Anderson G. (1994).A proactive model for training need analysis. Sydney, Australia: MCB University Press.

Aarabi, M.S., Subramaniam, I.D., & Almintisir, A.B. (2013). Relationship between motivational factors and job performance of employee in Malaysia Services Industry. *Asian Social Science. 9/9, 301-311.*

Badara, Mu'azu Saidu and Saidin, Siti Zabedah (2014) *Internal audit effectiveness: Data screening and preliminary analysis.* Asian Social Science, 10 (10).pp.76-85.ISSN 1911-2017.

Badlishah, S. (2018) Training effectiveness among general insurance agents and intention to transfer training as mediator. *(Doctoral of Philosophy,* Universiti Utara Malaysia.

Baldwin, TT, Magjuka, R.J., & Loher, B.T. (1991). The perils of participation: effect of choice of training on trainee motivation and learning, Personnel Psychology, 44(1), 51-65.

Baldwin, T.T., & Ford, J. K. (1988). Transfer of training: a review and directions for future research Personal Psychology, 41 (1), 63-105.

Barry, Crushway. (1994). *Human Resource Management.* London: Kogan Page Limited.

Bandura, Albert. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review. 84(2), 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological review*, 84(2), 191.

Bartlett, J. E., Kotrlik, J .W., Higgins, C. C. (2001). Organizational research: Determining appropriate sample size in survey research. *Information Technology, Learning, and Performance Journal*, *19*(1), 43 – 50. doi:https://doi.org/10.1109/LPT.2009.2020494.

Bennet, J.B., Lehman, W . E. K., & Forst, J. K. (1999). Change, transfer climate, customer orientation: A contextual model and analysis of change-driven training. Group & Organization Management, 24, 188 – 216.

Bruning, R. H., Schraw, G. J., & Ronning, R. R. (1999).Cognitive psychology and instruction.*Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.*

Broad, M.L. & J.W. Newstorm. (1992). Transfer of Training: Action-Packed Strategies to ensure High Payoff from Training Investment. Reading MA: Addison-Wesley.

Brown, T. C., & Mccracken, M. (2009). Building a bridge of understanding: How barriers to training participation become barriers to training effectiveness. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 33(6), 492-512.

Cacciatottlo, K. (2015). Defining workplace learning. *European Scientific Journal, ESJ,* 11(10).

Calantone, R. J., Cavusgil, S. T., & Zhao, Y. (2001). Learning orientation, firm innovation capability and firm performance.*Industrial Marketing Management, 31/6, 515-527.*

Carbery R & Caravan, T. N. (2011). *Conceptualising participation in formal training and development activities*: A Planned Behaviour Approach. Springer Science & Business Media.

Chanal, V. (2004). Innovation management and organizational learning: A discursive approach. *European Journal of Innovation Management, 7/1, 56-64.*

Chin, M.C., Chua, W.S., Ong, K.N., Tan, S.H., & Wong, S.L. (2016). The impact of motivation on employees' job performance at Prudential Assurance Malaysia Berhad in Seberang Jaya, Penang.*UniversitiTunku Abdul Rahman.*

Cheng, W.L (2000). Test of the MBA knowledge and skill transfer, International Journal of Human Resource Management, 11, 837 -852.

Chiaburu, D. S & Takleab, A. G (2005). Individual and contextual Influences on Multiple Dimensions of Training Effectiveness. Journal of European Industrial Training, 29, 604-626. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/03090590510627085.

Craig, R. L. (1996). Working in Higher Education. Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education. London: Open University Press.

Creswell, J.W. (2009). *Research design:qualitative and mixed method approaches*. Los Angeles, London, Delhi, Singapore: SAGE Publications. doi:https://doi.org/10.4135/978149208956.

Cohen, J. (1988). Statistical power analysis (2nd ed.). Hillsdale NJ: Erlbaum

Cooke, R. A., & Rousseau, D. M. (1984).Stress and strain from family roles and work-role expectations.*Journal of Applied Psychology, 69/2, 252-260.*

Cooper, D.R., & Schindler, P.S. (2014).*Business research methods.* Irwin: McGraw-Hill.

D'Amato, A.,& Zijlstra, F.R.H. (2008). Psychological climate and individual factors as antecedents of work outcomes. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 17/2, 33-54.*

Universiti Utara Malaysia

DiBella, A.J., Nevis, E.C.,& Gould, J.M. (1996). Understanding organizational learning capability.*Journal of Management Studies, 33/3, 361-79.*

Elangovan, A. R. and Karakowsky, L. (1999). The Role of Trainee and Environment Factors in Transfer of Training : An Exploratory Framework. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, pp. 268-275.

Elnaga, A.,& Imran, A. (2013). The Effect of Training on Employee Performance. *European Journal of Business and Management. 5/4, 137-147.*

Facteau, J.D., Dobbins, G.H., Russell, J.E.A., Ladd, RT., & Kudish, J.D.(1992J.The influence, of general perceptions of the training environment on motivation to learn and training transfer. A structural equations analysis. Paper given at the conference for the Society for Industrial and Organization Psychology, Montreal, Canada.

Fleishman, E.A, & Mumford M.D (1989). Individual attributes and training performance, in Goldstein, I.L (Eds), Training and Development in Organization, Jossey-Bass, San Franscisco, C.A.

Foxon, M.J (1993). A process approach to the transfer of training part 1: the impact of motivation and training system expectancies on transfer maintenance, *The Australian Journal of Educational Technology, 9,* 130-43.

Gelo, O., Braakmann, D., &Benetka, G.(2008). Quantitative and qualitative research: Beyond the debate. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science,* 42(3), 266-290. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s12124-008-9078-3

Gist, M.E, Stevens, C.K.,&Bavetta, A.G (1991). Effects of self-efficacy and post training intervention on the acquisition and maintenance of complex interpersonal skills, Personal Psychology, 44, 837 -861.

Universiti Utara Malaysia

Gong, Y., Huang, J.C., &Farh, J.L. (2009). Employee learning orientation, transformational leadership and employee creativity: The mediating role of employee creativity self-efficacy.*Academy of Management Journal, 52/4, 765-778.*

Goh, S.C. (2002). Managing Effective Knowledge Transfer: An Intergrative Framework and Some Practice Implications. Journal of Knowledge Management Vol. 1.pp. 22-30.

Goldstein, I.L. & Ford, J.K. (2002).*Training in organization: Needs assessment, development and evaluation*, CA: Wadsworth Group, Thompson Learning, Inc.

Greenberg, G. (1998). Distance education technologies: Best practices for K-12 settings. *IEEE Technology and Society Magazine, (Winter) 36-40.*

Hair, J. F., Money, A. H., Samouel, P., & Page, M. (2007).Research methods for business. *Education + Training,49(*4), 336 -337.doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/et.2007.49.4336.2

Hair, J.F., Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L and Black, W.C. (2010), *Multivariate Data Analysis: A Global Perspective.*New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Hair, J .F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R.E., &Tatham, R. L. (2006). Multivariate data analysis (Vol. 6).

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B.J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). Multivariate data analysis : Global edition.

Hair, J. F., Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C.M., & Mena, J. A. (2012). An assessment of the use of partial least squares structural equation modeling in marketing research, 40(3), 414-433.

Hasan, B.,& Ali, J.M.H. (2004). An empirical examination of a model of computer learning performance. Journal *of Computer Information Systems, 44/4, 27-33.*

Universiti Utara Malaysia

Harrison, D.A., Newman, D.A., Schmitt, N., &Highhouse, S. (2012). Absence, lateness, turnover, and retirement: narrow and broad understandings of withdrawal and behavioral engagement. *Handbook of Psychology, Vol.12, Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 262-91.

Holton, E. F III (2005). The flawed four-level evaluation model. *HRD Quarterly, 7(1)* 37-54

Honey, P., & Mumford, A. (1986). *Using your learning styles* (2nd Ed). Maidenhead: Peter Honey.

Hult, G.T., Robert, F.H., & Gary, A.K. (2004).Innovativeness: Its antecedents and impact on business performance. *Industrial Marketing Management, 33/5, 429-436.*

Hunt, C. S., & Hunt, B. (2004). Changing attitudes toward people with disabilities: experimenting with an educational intervention. *Journal of Administrative Issues*, 16, 266-280.

Jankingthongl, K.,&Rurkkhum, S. (2012). Factors affecting job performance: A review of literature. *Journal of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts*, 12/2, 115-127.

Karatepe, O.M., Uludag, O., Menevis, I., Hadzimehmedagic, L., &Baddar, L. (2006).The effects of selected individual characteristics on frontline employee performance and job satisfaction. *Tourism Management, 27/4, 547-560.*

Kirkpatrick, D.L. (1994). Evaluation training programs:, the Four Levels, San Francisco, CA, Berrett- Koehler.

Krejcie, R.V., & Morgan, D.W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. Educational and psychological measurement. *The NEA Research Bulletin, 38,99.*

Lim, H., Lee, S.G., &Nam, K. (2007).Validating e-learning factors affecting training effectiveness. *International Journal of Information Management, 27/1, 22-35.*

Universiti Utara Malaysia

Machin, M. A. (2002). Planing, managing, and optimizing transfer of training. in : K Kraiger (ed.), *Creating, Implementing, and Managing Effective Training and Development* (Pp.263-301). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McGill, M.E.,& Slocum, J.W. (1993). Unlearning the organization.*Organizational Dynamics, 67-79.*

Muhammad Ali Embi, (2001). Pendekatan Pengurusan Sumber Manusia Masa Kini. Kuala Lumpur: Utusan Publication & Distributors Sdn. Bhd.

Munisamy, S. (2013). Identifying factors that influences job performance amongst employees in oil palm plantation.*Open University Malaysia*.

Naharuddin, N.M.,&Sadegi, M. (2013). Factors of workplace environment that affect employees performance: A Case Study of Miyazu Malaysia. *International Journal of Independent Research and Studies, 2/2, 66-78.*

Neuman, W. L. (2000). Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches. Boston : Allyn and Bacon.

Nijman (2004). Decline of the endemic Hose's langurPresbytishosei in KayanMentarang National Park, East Borneo. Oryx, 39,pp 223-226.

Noe, R. A., and Schmitt, N. (1986). The influence of trainee attitudes on trainee effectiveness: A test of a model. *Personnel Psyhology*, 39, 497 – 523.

Noe, R. (2002). *Employee training and development. Boston*: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Noe, R.A. (2008). Employee Training and Development (Fourth Edition). New York : McGraw – Hill.

Universiti Utara Malaysia

Nonaka, I.,& Takeuchi, H. (1995). The Knowledge-creating Company, *Oxford University Press, New York, NY.*

Oldham, G.R.,& Cummings, A. (1996). Employee creativity: Personal and contextual factors at work. *Academy of Management Journal, 49, 607-634.*

Pallant, J. (2013). SPSS survival manual. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).

Parry, S. (1990). Bringing it back to work".*Taining and Development Journal.* Dec.44 (12), 15 – 17.

Quinones, M.A. 1997. (1997). Contextual influences: On training effectiveness, In Quinones, M.A. and Ehrenstein, A,(Eid). Training for a Rapidly Changing Workplace, Applications of Psychological Research, 177 – 199. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Royal Malaysia Airforce (RMAF) Prospectus and Anggaran Belanja Mengurus (ABM), 2019.

Rusu, G., Avasilcai, S.,& Hutu, C.A. (2016). Organizational context factors influencing employee performance appraisal: A Research Framework. *Social and Behavioural Sciences, 221, 57-65.*

Rosset, A. (July 1997). Training and Development, Vol. 51. Pp 18 -24.

Salanova, M., Grau, R.M., Cifre, E., &Llorens, S. (2000). Computer training, frequency of usage and burnout: the moderating role of computer self-efficacy. *Computers in Human Behavior, 16/6, 575-90.*

Salavou, H. (2004). The concept of innovativeness: Should we need to focus? European *Journal of Innovation Management, 7/1, 33-42.*

Universiti Utara Malaysia

Salomon, G. (1984). Television is ‘‘easy’’ and print is ‘‘tough’’: The differential investment of mental effort in learning as a function of perceptions and attributions. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 76,647–658.*

Scaduto, A., Lindsay, D., & Chiaburu, D. S. (2008). Leader influences on training effectiveness: motivation and outcome expectation processes. *International Journal of Training and Development,* 12(3). 158-170.

Scott, S.G.,& Bruce, R.A. (1994). Determinants of innovation behaviour: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal, 37, 580-607.*

Sekaran, U. (2003) Research Methods for Business: A Skill-Building Approach. 4th Edition, John Wiley & Sons, New York.

Sekaran, U. and Bougie.R (2013).Research Method for business (6thed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc Learning.

Sian, A. C.w., Ahmad, R., Ismail, A., & Ismail, W. K. W. (2011). Selected respondent characteristics and training program characteristic as determinants of trainees' perceptions of self-efficacy. *Journal Kemanusian,18.*

Sugrue, B., O'Driscoll, T., & Blair, D. (2005). What in the world is WLP? *Training & Development, 5*9(1), 51-52.

Tabachnick, B.G., &Fidell, L.S (2007).*Multivariate analysis of variance and covariance. Using Multivariate Statistics.* New York: Pearson Education Inc.

Tai, W. T. (2006). Effects of training framing, general self-efficacy and training motivation on trainee's training effectiveness. Personal Review, 35 (1), 51-65.

Tasse, A and MohamadHrimech (2002).*Increasing Learning Transfer Amongst Newly Trained Employees:* The Role of Supervisor.*www.wln.ualbertq.ca/paper/pdf41.pdf*

Universiti Utara Malaysia

Thao, L.T.T., & Hwang, C.J. (2013).Factors affecting employee performance - evidence from Petrovietnam Engineering Consultancy J.S.C.

Thayer, P.W. & M.S. Teachout (1995).“A Climate of Transfer Model”. Available at *http://www.usq.edu.au/users/machin/phd*

Thao, L.T.T., & Hwang, C.J. (2013).Factors affecting employee performance - evidence from Petrovietnam Engineering Consultancy J.S.C.

Tracey, J.B., Hinkin, T.R., Tannenbaum, S. and Mathieu, J.E. (2001). The influence of individual characteristic and the work environment on varying level of training outcome, Human Resource Development Quaterly, 12 (1), 5-23. Wills, 1993.

Tuan, H.L., Chin, C.C.,&Shieh, S.H. (2005). The development of a questionnaire to measure students’ motivation towards science learning. *International Journal of Science Education, 27/6, 639-654.*

Ulrich, D., Jick, T.,& Von Glinow, M.A. (1993). High-impact learning: building and diffusing learning capability. *Organizational Dynamics, 52-66.*

Wexley, K. N., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Developing and training human resources in organizations (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Zikmund, W., Babin, ., Carr, J., & Griffin, M. (2009). *Business Research Methods.* South-Western College Pub.

Zumrah, A.R. (2014). Service quality in Malaysia public sector: the role of transfer of training. Procedia-Social And Behavirol Sciences, 144 ,111 -117.

Universiti Utara Malaysia

APPENDIX A

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Universiti Utara Malaysia,
Sintok, 06010 Kedah

25th November 2019.

Survey Request for Academic Study on Training Effectiveness

Dear Respondents,

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this university research project. The objective of this research is to examine the factors affecting training effectiveness . My academic supervisors are Associate Professor Dr Kamal bin Abd Hamid and Dr Shahrizal bin Badlishah from Universiti Utara Malaysia (UUM).

All data collected in this survey is purely for academic purposes and is confidential and anonymous. If you have any query about this project, you may contact me at 012 4293833.

Thank you for your assistance,

Che Zunida bte Che Azmi
Master of Human Resource Management
Universiti Utara Malaysia

Che Zunida bte Che Azmi
Matrix No. 823418
Email**:** **zunidazmi@yahoo.com**

Instructions:

This questionnaire consists of six (6) pages. It will take approximately 15 minutes to answer all the questions in Section A, B, C ,D and E. There is no right or wrong answer for each question in this questionnaire. Your honest answer is the best answer. THANK YOU for your participation and support in this research.

Universiti Utara Malaysia

PART A: INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT

Instructions: Read the statement below and mark (/) your agreement with that statement.

Please use the following scale:

(1) Strongly Disagree; (2) Disagree: (3) Neutral; (4) Agree; (5) Strongly Agree

SELF –EFFICACY	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
1. I am always looking for a solution to get what I want.					
2. I believe I can face an unexpected event.					
3. I know how to handle unexpected situations.					
4. I can solve problems if I work hard.					
5. I am always calm when I have difficulty because I am confident in my ability.					
6. If I am in trouble, I can always think of a solution.					
7. I can usually deal with whatever comes into my life.					

Universiti Utara Malaysia

MOTIVATION	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
8. I have a strong desire to achieve something.					
9. I am ready to improve my work skills and knowledge.					
10. I am an independent person.					
11. I adapt easily to my work skills and knowledge.					
12. My self-control is high.					
13. I am confident in applying new skills acquired during training to my workplace.					
14. After the training, I am able to identify the right work environment to apply new knowledge and skills.					
15. I easily adapt to new skills.					
16. Training organized by my employer made me an excellent worker.					

Universiti Utara Malaysia

PART B: ENVIRONMENT ASSESSMENT

Instructions: Read the statement below and mark (/) your agreement with that statement.

Please use the following scale:

(1) Strongly Disagree; (2) Disagree: (3) Neutral; (4) Agree; (5) Strongly Agree

ENVIRONMENT	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
1. I am ready to share the new knowledge and skills gained during my workplace training.					
2. Co-workers can share new knowledge with others.					
3. Working group members, work together to apply new knowledge in the workplace.					
4. Co-workers who have taken the course pass the knowledge on to new employees at work.					
5. Co-workers who have taken the course pass the knowledge on to new employees at work.					

Universiti Utara Malaysia

PART C: EMPLOYEE LEARNING ASSESSMENT

Instructions: Read the statement below and mark (/) your agreement with that statement.

Please use the following scale:

(1) Strongly Disagree; (2) Disagree: (3) Neutral; (4) Agree; (5) Strongly Agree

EMPLOYEE LEARNING	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
1. I like solving problems using a step-by-step approach rather than guessing.					
2. I like what that I have learnt.					
3. I prefer simple exercises and not complicated ones.					
4. I don't take things for granted and I have to make sure.					
5. For me, the most important thing is for sure and it can be used at work.					
6. I'm actively looking for new projects to manage.					
7.As I gained new knowledge, I immediately began to plan how I could prove it.					
8.I feel anxious to shape something. I don't like to draw conclusions.					

Universiti Utara Malaysia

PART D: TRAINING EFFECTIVENESS ASSESSMENT

Instructions: Read the statement below and mark (/) your agreement with that statement.

Please use the following scale:

(1) Strongly disagree; (2) Disagree: (3) Neutral; (4) Agree; (5) Strongly agree

TRAINING EFFECTIVENESS	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
1. The Technical Basics course at ITAS has many benefits.					
2. The Technical Basics course has many drawbacks.					
3. Technical Basics courses have benefited me greatly.					
4. Technical Basics courses enhance my skills and knowledge.					
5. This Technical Basics course is very good.					
6. This Technical Basics course met my initial expectations.					
7. Personally, I think this program works.					

Universiti Utara Malaysia

PART E: INDIVIDUAL INFORMATION

Instructions: Please circle the answer that applies to you.

1. AGE GROUP:

a. 18 - 20
b 20 - 30
c. 30– 40

2. GENDER:

a. Male
b. Female

3. MARITAL STATUS

a. Single
b. Married
c. Widower/Widow

4. EDUCATION LEVEL

a. Certificate of Education Malaysia (SPM)
b. Diploma
c. Degree

5. LENGTH OF SERVICE

a. 1 - 5 years
b. 5 - 10 years
c. 10 - 15 years
d. 15 above

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

Universiti Utara Malaysia

APPENDIX B

SPSS OUTPUT

Frequencies

Statistics						
		Q1: Age	Q2: Gender	Q3: Marital Statuse	Q4: Education Level	Q5: Length of Service
N	Valid	100	100	100	100	100
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0

Frequency Table

Q1: Age					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2	100	100.0	100.0	100.0

Q2: Gender					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	92	92.0	92.0	92.0
	2	8	8.0	8.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Universiti Utara Malaysia

Q3: Marital Statuse					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	96	96.0	96.0	96.0
	2	4	4.0	4.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Q4: Education Level					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	1	1.0	1.0	1.0
	2	97	97.0	97.0	98.0
	3	2	2.0	2.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Q5: Length of Service					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	100	100.0	100.0	100.0

Universiti Utara Malaysia

Descriptive

Self-efficacy

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
SE Q 1	100	2	5	4.34	.590
SE Q 2	100	2	5	3.76	.653
SE Q 3	100	2	5	3.78	.733
SE Q 4	100	2	5	4.45	.592
SE Q 5	100	2	5	3.87	.706
SE Q 6	100	2	5	3.85	.687
SE Q 7	100	2	5	3.77	.750
Valid N (listwise)	100				

Motivation

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
MFL Q 8	100	3	5	4.36	.542
MFL Q 9	100	3	5	4.40	.586
MFL Q 10	100	3	5	4.24	.571
MFL Q 11	100	3	5	4.12	.591
MFL Q 12	100	2	5	3.89	.737
MFL Q 13	100	3	5	4.01	.541
MFL Q 14	100	3	5	4.08	.545
MFL Q 15	100	3	5	4.11	.567
MFL Q 16	100	3	5	4.24	.553
Valid N (listwise)	100				

Environment

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
OC Q 1	100	2	5	4.38	.599
OC Q 2	100	3	5	4.30	.577
OC Q 3	100	2	5	4.22	.579
OC Q 4	100	1	5	4.14	.652
OC Q 5	100	1	5	4.26	.705
Valid N (listwise)	100				

Employee Learning

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
EL Q 1	100	3	5	3.99	.611
EL Q 2	100	1	5	4.12	.756
EL Q 3	100	2	5	4.32	.709
EL Q 4	100	2	5	4.18	.657
EL Q 5	100	2	5	4.19	.631
EL Q 6	100	1	5	3.59	.726
EL Q 7	100	2	5	3.96	.634
EL Q 8	100	1	5	3.57	.924
Valid N (listwise)	100				

Universiti Utara Malaysia

Training Effectiveness

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
SE Q 1	100	2	5	4.34	.590
TE Q 1	100	2	5	4.59	.621
TE Q 2	100	1	5	2.24	1.055
TE Q 3	100	3	5	4.43	.573
TE Q 4	100	3	5	4.43	.573
TE Q 5	100	3	5	4.47	.559
TE Q 6	100	3	5	4.18	.626
TE Q 7	100	1	5	4.35	.672
Valid N (listwise)	100				

Descriptive statistic

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
Dependent Variable Training Effectiveness	4.098	.381
Independent Variable		
Individual Factors -Self-effectiveness -Motivations for Learning	4.06 3.97 4.16	.403 .497 .372
Environment Factor -Organization Culture	4.26	.493
Employee Learning Factor	3.99	.455

Universiti Utara Malaysia

Normality Test Skewness and Kurtosis

Statistics					
		Individual Factor	Environment Factor	Employee Learning	Training Effectiveness
N	Valid	100	100	100	100
	Missing	0	0	0	0
Skewness		-.030	-1.172	-.365	.104
Std. Error of Skewness		.241	.241	.241	.241
Kurtosis		.178	5.092	.471	-.458
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.478	.478	.478	.478

Reliability
Individual Factors

Case Processing Summary			
		N	%
Cases	Valid	100	100.0
	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	100	100.0

a. List wise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics		
Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.900	.900	16

Item Statistics			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
SE Q 1	4.34	.590	100
SE Q 2	3.76	.653	100
SE Q 3	3.78	.733	100
SE Q 4	4.45	.592	100
SE Q 5	3.87	.706	100
SE Q 6	3.85	.687	100
SE Q 7	3.77	.750	100
MFL Q 8	4.36	.542	100
MFL Q 9	4.40	.586	100
MFL Q 10	4.24	.571	100
MFL Q 11	4.12	.591	100
MFL Q 12	3.89	.737	100
MFL Q 13	4.01	.541	100
MFL Q 14	4.08	.545	100
MFL Q 15	4.11	.567	100
MFL Q 16	4.24	.553	100

Universiti Utara Malaysia

Inter-Item Correlation Matrix																
	SE Q 1	SE Q 2	SE Q 3	SE Q 4	SE Q 5	SE Q 6	SE Q 7	MFL Q 8	MFL Q 9	MFL Q 10	MFL Q 11	MFL Q 12	MFL Q 13	MFL Q 14	MFL Q 15	MFL Q 16
SE Q 1	1.000	.345	.409	.338	.447	.501	.316	.562	.304	.175	.461	.342	.401	.418	.431	.212
SE Q 2	.345	1.000	.564	.308	.392	.437	.628	.218	.332	.292	.311	.385	.321	.253	.263	.217
SE Q 3	.409	.564	1.000	.370	.491	.596	.660	.278	.254	.272	.388	.422	.362	.348	.351	.281
SE Q 4	.338	.308	.370	1.000	.431	.515	.326	.434	.436	.096	.277	.114	.395	.420	.423	.284
SE Q 5	.447	.392	.491	.431	1.000	.563	.458	.388	.469	.103	.328	.477	.321	.369	.314	.210
SE Q 6	.501	.437	.596	.515	.563	1.000	.599	.309	.477	.350	.368	.486	.466	.437	.484	.282
SE Q 7	.316	.628	.660	.326	.458	.599	1.000	.181	.280	.319	.314	.447	.354	.392	.393	.208
MFL Q 8	.562	.218	.278	.434	.388	.309	.181	1.000	.433	.077	.274	.201	.332	.347	.298	.181
MFL Q 9	.304	.332	.254	.436	.469	.477	.280	.433	1.000	.224	.327	.243	.306	.373	.383	.168
MFL Q 10	.175	.292	.272	.096	.103	.350	.319	.077	.224	1.000	.303	.256	.417	.295	.386	.232
MFL Q 11	.461	.311	.388	.277	.328	.368	.314	.274	.327	.303	1.000	.448	.502	.504	.383	.313
MFL Q 12	.342	.385	.422	.114	.477	.486	.447	.201	.243	.256	.448	1.000	.281	.450	.319	.313
MFL	.401	.321	.362	.395	.321	.466	.354	.332	.306	.417	.502	.281	1.000	.511	.523	.330

Universiti Utara Malaysia

Q 13																
MFL Q 14	.418	.253	.348	.420	.369	.437	.392	.347	.373	.295	.504	.450	.511	1.000	.528	.372
MFL Q 15	.431	.263	.351	.423	.314	.484	.393	.298	.383	.386	.383	.319	.523	.528	1.000	.334
MFL Q 16	.212	.217	.281	.284	.210	.282	.208	.181	.168	.232	.313	.313	.330	.372	.334	1.000

Universiti Utara Malaysia

Item-Total Statistics					
	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
SE Q 1	60.93	35.561	.593	.544	.893
SE Q 2	61.51	35.242	.568	.507	.894
SE Q 3	61.49	33.949	.655	.570	.891
SE Q 4	60.82	35.927	.535	.503	.895
SE Q 5	61.40	34.465	.617	.507	.892
SE Q 6	61.42	33.680	.743	.660	.887
SE Q 7	61.50	33.949	.637	.616	.891
MFL Q 8	60.91	36.749	.462	.465	.897
MFL Q 9	60.87	36.074	.520	.452	.896
MFL Q 10	61.03	37.039	.391	.319	.900
MFL Q 11	61.15	35.684	.573	.456	.894
MFL Q 12	61.38	34.743	.551	.499	.895
MFL Q 13	61.26	35.871	.604	.484	.893
MFL Q 14	61.19	35.691	.629	.506	.892
MFL Q 15	61.16	35.671	.604	.474	.893
MFL Q 16	61.03	37.060	.403	.234	.899

Scale Statistics			
Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
65.27	40.078	6.331	16

Universiti Utara Malaysia

Reliability
Environment Factor

Case Processing Summary			
		N	%
Cases	Valid	100	100.0
	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	100	100.0
a. List wise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.			

Reliability Statistics		
Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.850	.851	5

Universiti Utara Malaysia

Item Statistics			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
OC Q 1	4.38	.599	100
OC Q 2	4.30	.577	100
OC Q 3	4.22	.579	100
OC Q 4	4.14	.652	100
OC Q 5	4.26	.705	100

Inter-Item Correlation Matrix					
	OC Q 1	OC Q 2	OC Q 3	OC Q 4	OC Q 5
OC Q 1	1.000	.543	.485	.561	.457
OC Q 2	.543	1.000	.496	.505	.451
OC Q 3	.485	.496	1.000	.614	.527
OC Q 4	.561	.505	.614	1.000	.689
OC Q 5	.457	.451	.527	.689	1.000

Item-Total Statistics					
	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
OC Q 1	16.92	4.196	.626	.416	.828
OC Q 2	17.00	4.303	.607	.389	.833
OC Q 3	17.08	4.196	.658	.443	.820
OC Q 4	17.16	3.752	.758	.602	.791
OC Q 5	17.04	3.776	.663	.501	.821

Scale Statistics			
Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
21.30	6.091	2.468	5

Reliability
Employee Learning

Case Processing Summary			
		N	%
Cases	Valid	100	100.0
	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	100	100.0
a. List wise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.			

Reliability Statistics		
Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.794	.799	8

Item Statistics			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
EL Q 1	3.99	.611	100
EL Q 2	4.12	.756	100
EL Q 3	4.32	.709	100
EL Q 4	4.18	.657	100
EL Q 5	4.19	.631	100
EL Q 6	3.59	.726	100
EL Q 7	3.96	.634	100
EL Q 8	3.57	.924	100

Inter-Item Correlation Matrix								
	EL Q 1	EL Q 2	EL Q 3	EL Q 4	EL Q 5	EL Q 6	EL Q 7	EL Q 8
EL Q 1	1.000	.440	.124	.306	.319	.309	.207	.261
EL Q 2	.440	1.000	.399	.444	.397	.238	.305	.321
EL Q 3	.124	.399	1.000	.287	.314	.179	.411	.228
EL Q 4	.306	.444	.287	1.000	.575	.326	.235	.295
EL Q 5	.319	.397	.314	.575	1.000	.436	.398	.384
EL Q 6	.309	.238	.179	.326	.436	1.000	.403	.427
EL Q 7	.207	.305	.411	.235	.398	.403	1.000	.332
EL Q 8	.261	.321	.228	.295	.384	.427	.332	1.000

Item-Total Statistics					
	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
EL Q 1	27.93	11.177	.425	.257	.782
EL Q 2	27.80	10.061	.554	.389	.762
EL Q 3	27.60	10.848	.414	.273	.784
EL Q 4	27.74	10.558	.538	.398	.766
EL Q 5	27.73	10.341	.628	.457	.753
EL Q 6	28.33	10.385	.507	.332	.770
EL Q 7	27.96	10.786	.503	.321	.771
EL Q 8	28.35	9.624	.490	.268	.778

Universiti Utara Malaysia

Scale Statistics			
Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
31.92	13.286	3.645	8

Reliability
Training Effectiveness

Case Processing Summary			
		N	%
Cases	Valid	100	100.0
	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	100	100.0
a. List wise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.			

Universiti Utara Malaysia

Reliability Statistics		
Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.626	.736	7

Item Statistics			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
TE Q 1	4.59	.621	100
TE Q 2	2.24	1.055	100
TE Q 3	4.43	.573	100
TE Q 4	4.43	.573	100
TE Q 5	4.47	.559	100
TE Q 6	4.18	.626	100
TE Q 7	4.35	.672	100

Inter-Item Correlation Matrix							
	TE Q 1	TE Q 2	TE Q 3	TE Q 4	TE Q 5	TE Q 6	TE Q 7
TE Q 1	1.000	-.311	.500	.472	.474	.296	.323
TE Q 2	-.311	1.000	-.106	-.206	-.176	.010	-.063
TE Q 3	.500	-.106	1.000	.569	.561	.486	.340
TE Q 4	.472	-.206	.569	1.000	.719	.402	.366
TE Q 5	.474	-.176	.561	.719	1.000	.478	.418
TE Q 6	.296	.010	.486	.402	.478	1.000	.425
TE Q 7	.323	-.063	.340	.366	.418	.425	1.000

Item-Total Statistics					
	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
TE Q 1	24.10	5.646	.377	.374	.578
TE Q 2	26.45	7.098	-.190	.124	.828
TE Q 3	24.26	5.245	.599	.467	.517
TE Q 4	24.26	5.326	.564	.570	.528
TE Q 5	24.22	5.244	.621	.591	.514
TE Q 6	24.51	5.182	.552	.352	.524
TE Q 7	24.34	5.297	.451	.257	.552

Scale Statistics			
Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
28.69	7.145	2.673	7

Universiti Utara Malaysia

Person Correlation

Correlations					
		Training Effectiveness	Individual Factors	Environment Factor	Employee Learning Factor
Training Effectiveness	Pearson Correlation	1	.503**	.342**	.479**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	100	100	100	100
Individual Factors	Pearson Correlation	.503**	1	.532**	.551**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	100	100	100	100
Environment Factor	Pearson Correlation	.342**	.532**	1	.559**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	100	100	100	100
Employee Learning Factor	Pearson Correlation	.479**	.551**	.559**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	100	100	100	100
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).					

Regression

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.559[a]	.313	.284	.32322
a. Predictors: (Constant), Employee Learning, Self-efficacy , Organizational Culture, Motivation for Learning				

Universiti Utara Malaysia

ANOVA[a]						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	4.512	4	1.128	10.797	.000[b]
	Residual	9.925	95	.104		
	Total	14.437	99			
a. Dependent Variable: Training Effectiveness						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Employee Learning, Self-efficacy , Organizational Culture, Motivation for Learning						

Coefficients[a]						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.857	.382		4.866	.000
	Self-efficacy	.192	.094	.250	2.041	.044
	Motivation for Learning	.114	.141	.111	.810	.420
	Organizational Culture	.002	.085	.003	.029	.977
	Employee Learning	.249	.093	.297	2.685	.009
a. Dependent Variable: Training Effectiveness						

Universiti Utara Malaysia